Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
MAR 18 1976
MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975.

No. 75-616

METROPOLITAN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, ET AL.,

Respondents,

vs.

THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

NORTHWEST OPPORTUNITY CENTER AND ELUTERIA D. MALDONADO,

Intervening Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT.

OBJECTIONS TO MOTION OF THE LEAGUES OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, ILLINOIS, COOK COUNTY, AND ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-MT. PROSPECT AREA, THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS CLERGY FELLOWSHIP AND THE MINORITY INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COUNCIL, INC. FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE.

JACK M. SIEGEL,
39 South LaSalle Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60603,
312-263-2968,
Attorney for Petitioners.

Gunthorp-Warren Printing Company, Chicago • Financial 6-6565

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1975.

No. 75-616.

METROPOLITAN HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, ET AL.,

Respondents,

vs.

THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS, ET AL.,

Petitioners,

NORTHWEST OPPORTUNITY CENTER AND ELUTERIA D. MALDONADO,

Intervening Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT.

OBJECTIONS TO MOTION OF THE LEAGUES OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, ILLINOIS, COOK COUNTY, AND ARLINGTON HEIGHTS-MT. PROSPECT AREA, THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, THE ARLINGTON HEIGHTS CLERGY FELLOWSHIP AND THE MINORITY INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS COUNCIL, INC. FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE.

Now comes the Village of Arlington Heights, et al., petitioners herein, by Jack M. Siegel, their attorney, and, pursuant to Rule 42(3) of the United States Supreme Court, object to

the motion of the Leagues of Women Voters of the United States, Illinois, Cook County, and Arlington Heights-Mt. Prospect Area, the American Jewish Committee, the Arlington Heights Clergy Fellowship and the Minority Industrial Relations Council, Inc. for leave to file brief as amicus curiae. In support of said objections, petitioners say as follows:

1. That the motion fails to concisely state the nature of the applicants' interest, but instead merely contains general statements as to the nature of the activities of the applicants, and fails to set forth any justiciable interest in the subject matter of this cause or the issues raised.

2. That said motion fails to set forth facts or questions of law that have not been presented by the parties or reasons for believing that they will not be adequately presented by the parties. That, in fact, the respondents herein have heretofore filed a brief in excess of 50 pages which comprehensively raises and briefs all the questions involved in this cause.

3. That the motion fails to set forth any questions of law or fact which are relevant to the disposition of the case which have not been raised in the briefs heretofore filed with this Court.

4. That none of the applicants herein sought to intervene or participate in the trial below in the District Court for the Northern District of Illinois or in the proceedings before the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. That the general allegations of the motion are insufficient to show the interest of the applicants or the necessity of their filing a brief as amicus curiae in order to fully advise and inform the Court as to the issues in this cause.

5. That the petitioners herein have heretofore withheld consent for the filing of said brief for the reason that the necessity of answering the brief as amicus curiae would impose an unreasonable and unnecessary burden upon these petitioners, without any additional aid to this Court in determining the issues before it.

6. That the motion of the applicants fails to set forth facts showing wherein the membership of the various organizations has in fact consented to said motion or the filing of said brief, and the applicants never sought or allowed the petitioners to present their point of view to the applicants prior to the determination by the applicants to seek to file a brief herein.

WHEREFORE, the petitioners respectfully object to the filing of said brief as amicus curiae and respectfully request that said motion be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

JACK M. SIEGEL,
39 South LaSalle Street,
Chicago, Illinois 60603,
312-263-2968,
Attorney for Petitioners.